



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,367	11/06/2003	David C. Bultman	343355600057	8494
7590	04/24/2006		EXAMINER	
John V. Biernacki Jones Day North Point 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/702,367	BULTMAN, DAVID C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6/2003</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.101 because the language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practice application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.

Claims 1-26 recite "a computer-implemented B-tree structure". However, the claims 1-26 contain non-functional data structure. Thus, the body of claims 1-26 is merely abstract idea and is being processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hara (US 6571250).

As to claim 1, Hara teaches a computer-implemented B-tree structure for information processing involving a database system with a plurality of data records, wherein a set of the data records have duplicate keys (col. 4, lines 15-30):

“a plurality of interconnected nodes having a root node, index nodes and leaf nodes” as (col. 4, lines 15-30);

“wherein a leaf node is configured to store a first key corresponding to first data in a first data page” as (col. 4, lines 30-45);

“wherein the first data in the first data page is configured to store a second key that is a duplicate of the first key and that corresponds to second data stored on a second data page” as (col. 11, lines 25-30).

As to claim 3, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said first data page and second data page comprise different pages” as (fig. 10).

As to claim 5, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said first data and second data are different” as (fig. 10).

As to claim 6, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said first data has variable length” as (col. 10, lines 50-55).

As to claim 7, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said second data has variable length” as (col. 10, lines 55-63).

As to claim 8, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein degree of the leaf nodes is not substantially affected by the variable length of the first and second data” as (col. 4, lines 32-43).

As to claim 9, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein degree of the leaf nodes is not substantially affected because the first and second data are stored separate from the leaf nodes” as (col. 4, lines 32-43).

As to claim 11, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with a find operation” as (col. 6, lines 25-45).

As to claim 12, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with a find-next operation” as (col. 6, lines 25-45).

As to claim 13, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with a find-previous operation” as (fig. 5).

As to claim 14, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with a find-first operation" as (fig. 5).

As to claim 15, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with a find-last operation" as (fig. 5).

As to claim 16, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with an insert operation" as (col. 7, lines 55-56).

As to claim 17, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the B-tree is configured to operate with a delete operation" as (col. 12, lines 10-15).

As to claim 18, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein data associated with the first and second keys are stored separate from the leaf nodes" as (col. 4 lines 15-30).

As to claim 19, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the first and second keys each have a corresponding unique data record value" as (col. 11, lines 25-30).

As to claim 20, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein substantially concurrently executing processes update the first and second keys at approximately the

same time without being locked out by another process because the first and second data are stored on different data pages" as (col. 11, lines 15-25).

As to claim 21, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the processes are threads" as (col. 11, lines 15-25).

As to claim 22, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein page and offset for the second key's value follow the second data on the second data page" as (col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 1-5).

As to claim 23, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein each page has associated with it a lock handle, wherein because the B-tree is self-balancing, an insert operation to the B-tree avoids locking the entire B-tree or subtree" as (col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 1-5).

As to claim 24, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the leaf nodes contain more than two key-value entries" as (fig. 11).

As to claim 25, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the second key is a duplicate key of the first key, wherein the second data is configured to store a third key that is a duplicate of the first key and that corresponds to third data stored on a third data page" as (fig. 1, col. 15, lines 1-30; col. 8, lines 55-67).

As to claim 26, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the second key is a duplicate key of the first key, wherein the second data is configured to store a third key that is a duplicate of the first key and that corresponds to third data stored on the second data page” as (fig. 1, col. 15, lines 1-30; col. 8, lines 55-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara (US 6571250) in view of Li (US 6647381).

As to claim 2, Hara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein said first data page and second data page comprise the same page”.

Li teaches the same page (col. 10, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Li's teaching of the same page to Hara's system in order to backup the system when a page in the system is corrupted.

As to claim 4, Hara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein said first data and second data are the same”.

Li teaches the same page (col. 10, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Li's teaching of the same page to Hara's system in order to backup the system when a page in the system is corrupted.

8. Claims 10, 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara (US 6571250) in view of Ishak et al (or hereinafter "Ishak") (US 5475837).

As to claim 10, Hara teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said plurality of leaf nodes are maintained in sequential order" as (fig. 9).

Hara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation with a doubly linked list which connects each of said leaf node with its sibling nodes".

Ishak teaches a doubly linked list which connects each leaf node with its sibling nodes (fig. 2, col. 5, lines 25-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ishak's teaching of a doubly linked list which connects each leaf node with its sibling nodes to Hara's system in order to permit a B-tree to be concurrently traversed for the purpose of reading while the B-tree is actually in the process of restructuring (col. 1, lines 45-55).

As to claim 27, Hara teaches the claimed limitation computer-implemented method for concurrent execution of a plurality of transactions in a database system

containing a plurality of data records, wherein a set of the data records have duplicate keys, said method comprising (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-30):

“storing said plurality of data records in a B* tree structure with a plurality of index nodes and a plurality of leaf nodes” as (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-30);

“wherein each of said leaf nodes includes a plurality of elements each having a first pointer configured to store a first key corresponding to first data in a first data page” as (col. 11, lines 25-30; col. 4, lines 15-30);

“wherein said first data further includes a second pointer configured to store a second key that is same as said first key and that corresponds to second data in a second data page” as the data store a duplicated key that corresponds to data of another page. The data does not include a second pointer (col. 11, lines 25-30);

“implementing said plurality of transactions by concurrently locating and operating on the target data records stored in said data pages through use of said B* tree structure” as (fig. 1, col. 8, lines 55-67).

Hara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “a second pointer”.

Ishak teaches a second pointer (figs.1&6C, col. 9, lines 1-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ishak’s teaching of a second pointer to Hara’s system in order to permit a B-tree to be concurrently traversed for the purpose of reading while the B-tree is actually in the process of restructuring (col. 1, lines 45-55).

As to claim 28, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein said step of implementing said plurality of transactions further includes implementing a concurrency control protocol” as (col. 8, lines 40-45).

As to claim 29, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the concurrency control protocol controls a first of said transactions to access first data in the first data page and concurrently a second of said transactions to access second data in the second data page, wherein said first data and second data have the same key” as (col. 11, lines 15-30; col. 8, lines 55-67).

As to claim 30, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the concurrency control protocol is a lock-based protocol” as (col. 1, lines 30-50).

As to claim 31, Hara teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the lock-based protocol releases locks on index nodes and leaf nodes when the data page is identified” as (col. 1, lines 30-50).

As to claim 32, Hara teaches the claimed limitation a computer-readable medium for concurrent execution of a plurality of transactions in a database system containing a plurality of data records, wherein a set of the data records have duplicate keys, comprising instructions for (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-30):

"storing said plurality of data records within a B* tree structure that has a plurality of index nodes and a plurality of leaf nodes, wherein each of said leaf nodes includes a plurality of elements having a first pointer configured to store a first key corresponding to first data in a first data page" as (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-30);

"wherein said first data further includes a second pointer configured to store a second key that is same as said first key and that corresponds to second data in a second data page" as the data store a duplicated key that corresponds to data of another page. The data does not include a second pointer (col. 11, lines 25-30);

"implementing said plurality of transactions by concurrently locating and operating on the target data records stored in said data pages" as (fig. 1, col. 8, lines 55-67).

Hara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a second pointer".

Ishak teaches a second pointer (figs.1&6C, col. 9, lines 1-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ishak's teaching of a second pointer to Hara's system in order to permit a B-tree to be concurrently traversed for the purpose of reading while the B-tree is actually in the process of restructuring (col. 1, lines 45-55).

As to claim 33, Hara teaches the claimed limitations:

" a plurality of data records with a first set of data records having duplicate keys, said plurality of data records stored in a B* tree structure with a plurality of index nodes and a plurality of leaf nodes, wherein each of said leaf nodes includes a plurality of

elements having a first pointer configured to store a first key which corresponds to first data stored in a first data page" as (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-30);

"wherein said first data includes a second pointer configured to store a second key that is a duplicate of the first key and that corresponds to second data in a second data page" as the data store a duplicated key that corresponding to data of another page. The data does not include a second pointer (col. 11, lines 25-30);

"an engine for implementing a plurality of transactions by concurrently locating and operating on the data records stored in the data pages" as (col. 1, lines 30-50);

"a concurrency-control manager for implementing a concurrency control protocol through use of the B* tree structure" as (col. 8, lines 40-45; col. 11, lines 15-25).

Hara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a second pointer".

Ishak teaches a second pointer (figs.1&6C, col. 9, lines 1-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ishak's teaching of a second pointer to Hara's system in order to permit a B-tree to be concurrently traversed for the purpose of reading while the B-tree is actually in the process of restructuring (col. 1, lines 45-55).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jain et al (US 5983237).

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162